

Moore County CTP Presentation
Moore County Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes
December 14, 2011; 2:00 – 4:00 PM

Attendees Present:

Scott W. Walston, PE	NCDOT - TPB
Frances D. Bisby, EI	NCDOT – TPB
Ashley Clowes	NCDOT - TPB
Matt Day, AICP	Triangle J Council of Governments, Triangle Area RPO
Debra Ensminger, CZO	Moore County, Planning and Community Development
Jeremy Rust	Moore County, Planning and Community Development
Tim Johnson	Division 8 Engineer
Jimmy Melton	Moore County
Kathy Liles	Aberdeen
Carol Sparks	Carthage
Kathy Blake	Southern Pines
Pat Ann McMurray	Aberdeen
Carol Lucas	Cameron
Donald Campbell	Cameron
Sharyl Carter	Whispering Pines
Fred Walden	Southern Pines
Karen O'Hara	Carthage
Landon Russell	Southern Pines
Ray MacKay	Seven Lakes
Robert Farrell	Aberdeen
Milton Dowdy	Carthage
Chris Smithson	Southern Pines
Mark Packard	MC BOCC
Nancy Roy-Fiorillo	Pinehurst
Fred Monroe	
John McDonald	
Tom Daniel	
David M. Wilson	
John Cashion	
John Monroe	
Harry Huberth	
Dick Moore	
George Erickson	
Gladys Fox	
Addie McCrimmon	
Ed Dennison	
Earl Ingram	
Glenn Bower	
Stephen Later	
Kathy Kirst	

Robert Hayter
Bob McVay
John McKean
Harold Watts
Kathleen Oleson
George Hayfield
Aketa Emptage
O'Linda Gillis
Jonathon Poverud
Nellie Jenkins
John McInerney

Introductions: Mr. Jimmy Melton, Moore County Commissioner, opened the meeting with introductions and traditional salutations. NCDOT provided the anticipated schedule for receipt of the consultant's report and a summary of the charrettes participation. The focus of the presentation centered on the public feedback and questions received during the charrettes regarding the Strategic Highway Corridors and other transportation regulations.

Presentation: All presentations can be viewed on the project page with summary outline provided below: <http://www.ncdot.gov/projects/moorechoices/>

The Next Steps

- **Strings and Ribbons Update**
 - Available charrette material was posted Tuesday, 12/13/2011.
 - Received the first spreadsheets from Neighborhood Solutions on 12/13/2011.
- **How to Process and Present the Data?**
 - Database of participants:
 - Formatting of report is under consideration. Issues include, but not limited to, how best to protect the privacy of participants, how data will be mapped, and the organization and presentation of spreadsheets and data.
 - Mapping of participants will allow NCDOT to determine where additional outreach is needed, origin of participants, and community perspectives.
 - Questionnaire Responses
 - Explanation of details relayed in the questionnaires at the charrettes.
 - Determines travel patterns, perceived needs, and priorities
 - Comment Database
 - Received 433 comments.
 - Participant's addresses used to identify the communities' level of participation and individual community perspectives.
 - Contact information available for the next round of public involvement.
 - Measure of Effectiveness provides feedback to the staff and allow for improvement and comparison analysis.
 - Public input received from the charrettes assisted NCDOT in documenting the local priorities, preferences, and concerns.
- **North Carolina's Strategic Highway Corridors in Moore County**
 - Many questions were asked about the Strategic Highway Corridors Vision Plan and the CTP process during and after the charrettes. Staff recognized the need for additional clarification.
 - Goals and objectives of the SHCs:
 - Provide a network of high mobility, safe, and reliable highways.
 - Select corridors focused on providing safety and mobility and connectivity to activity centers and other major routes.
 - Connectivity is a crucial for economic welfare of the state. Life line for freight and commerce. Key element in both state and federal transportation regulation.
- **Where did the Policy Originate From?**
 - The Strategic Highway Corridor Vision Plan was approved on September 2, 2004, and is part of the Statewide Transportation Plan.

- The plan represents the future vision for a series of highways with statewide and regional importance.
- The policy was approved by Department of Environmental and Natural Resources (DENR), the Department of Commerce, NCDOT's Board of Transportation (BOT), and the Governor.
- SHC policy is the tool used by NCDOT to comply with, and implement, federal and state long-range planning laws.
- **Federal Regulation**
 - Title 23 of the United States Code Section 135 (23 USC 135)
 - Supports economic growth and vitality through an effective transportation system.
 - Emphasizes the accommodation of freight and its importance to national economic welfare.
 - Goals and objectives include the preservation and optimization of existing facilities.
 - Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450.214 (23 CFR 450.214) Sub-part B
 - Defines state's responsibility in long-range planning process. Empowers statewide plan to reference policy, objectives, goals, and studies.
 - The CTP itself is defined by state law, but it is the mechanism used by the state to comply with federal regulations. Federal regulations mandate the long-range planning and development of multi-modal transportation systems.
- **State Regulation**
 - 136-44.1. Further defines the roles, responsibilities, and policies the BOT and NCDOT are subject to follow in the performance of their duties.
 - *NCDOT mandated to develop and maintain statewide system of roads commensurate with the needs of the State as a whole.*
 - *NCDOT is not allowed to sacrifice statewide interest for purely local desires.*
 - *Empowers BOT to formulate policy and plans for a statewide system.*
 - 136-45. General purpose of law; control, repair, and maintenance of highways.
 - *Emphasizes that routes to activity centers must be maintained.*
 - *Requires the use of the most practical routes with deference paid to agriculture and commercial/natural resources.*
 - 136-66.2. *Calls for each municipality to develop a CTP that will serve present and future travel demand in and around the municipality.*
 - Emphasizes that a long term plan must be developed.
 - Requirement of current land use plan.
 - At any time, either the municipality or the Department of Transportation may propose changes in the plan at any time by giving notice to the other party and following the same process of mutual adoption.
 - Acknowledges county may participate under the same stipulations as municipalities.
- **NCDOT's Statewide Long-Range Plan**
 - NCDOT's statewide, long-range transportation plan is mandated under federal law.
 - Long-Range Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan was developed from 2000-2003.
 - Involved an intensive planning process, technical analysis, and public outreach.

- NCDOT held public meetings across the state; public comment documented at the Southern Pines session 1/14/2004.
- Plan adopted by the BOT in September of 2004 and revised in July 2008.
- The plan is used to determine budgets and funding needs for the State Transportation Improvement Program.
- Provides framework for NCDOT to determine the needs of each mode of transportation, estimate impacts of congestion, and allocated current/future funds.
- Defines the Strategic Highway Corridor Visions.
- Plan is under revision and being updated through the 2040 Plan.
- **Strategic Highway Corridors Vision Plan**
 - 55 corridors, 5,400 miles of highway, 7 percent of the State's highway system carries 45 percent of the State's traffic.
 - Purpose: To provide a network of high-speed, safe, reliable highways.
 - Corridors visions designate facility type by cross section, access management, and function: freeway, expressway, boulevard, or thoroughfare.
 - Purpose of designation is to provide consistency, guidance for funding decisions, guidance for project planning and design decisions, access management, and local land use decisions.
 - Criteria for Strategic Highway Corridors (SHCs):
 - Mobility
 - Connectivity to activity centers
 - Connectivity to interstates
 - Interstate relief routes
 - Major hurricane evacuation routes
 - Corridors are already included in a national or statewide highway system
 - Definition of activity center
 - Selection of Strategic Highway Corridors
 - Selected from a statewide perspective.
 - Independent of municipal and county boundaries.
 - Emphasized connectivity, movement of goods, destination centers, and the functionality of the roadways.
 - Criteria both quantifiable and subjective.
 - Quantifiable criteria.
 - Subjective criteria.
 - Ability to move goods to market expeditiously, efficiently, and more economically.
 - SHCs emphasize routes and connectivity to rail line terminals, airports, sea/river ports in accordance with federal regulation. Key for statewide commerce and in accordance with federal and state regulations.
 - Designation of Facility Types
 - Facility types designated to create consistency along corridors.
 - Facility type based on function of roadway, travel demand, level of mobility and access management. Other factors determining facility type are dictated by need for traffic signals, driveways, and/or medians.
 - Establishing vision facilitates preliminary cost estimate.
 - System management and operation provides analysis criteria.

- Designation of facility type facilitates arterial corridor management, coordination, event management, transit utilization, and commercial vehicle programs, etc.
- Use of access management techniques is important in achieving the concept goals of SHC.
- Access management definition and benefits.
- Each corridor must be studied further through CTP process

- **County Resolutions**

- The Mayors and Towns of Southern Pines, Aberdeen, Pinebluff, and the Village of Pinehurst agreed to oppose US 1 Bypass scenario.
 - TPB committed to bringing Moore County a different CTP process.
 - CTP recommendations must be endorsed/adopted by participating municipalities, the county, and the RPO to be recognized as a final plan.
 - TPB interprets resolution as a strong statement of local priorities and preferences.
 - TPB plans to continue with CTP development based on local input and SHC compliance.

Public Comment: Steven Later was recognized and interjected that the intent of the resolution was not just to object to a US 1 bypass through the Walthour-Moss Foundation, but horse Country in its entirety.

- A: For the BOT to adopt the CTP, it has to be congruent with the statewide plan and the current state policies. Based on the current state policy and for the purposes of the CTP, US 1 will need to be analyzed and considered under a freeway scenario.
- As of December 1st, the Moore County Origin and Destination Study with Parson Brinkerhoff (PB) moved forward. Study will be conducted between March and April.
- A current and 2040 traffic model will be developed.
- Scenario recommended by the local officials will be studied and analyzed. This is where the alternatives collected during the charrettes will come into play.
- NCDOT's recommendation to the MCTC
 - Public outreach and participation is used to establish the local vision and priorities.
 - The Charrette process was used to help document local priorities. Resolutions clarified these priorities.
 - *A CTP is an engineering process. Without data, a final corridor recommendation cannot move forward. Would like to move forward with standard CTP process.*
 - Recommendation will not be included in CTP without MCTC and local Board adoption.
 - TPB will need to identify and examine multiple scenarios *with the understanding that "what happens in the circle, stays in the circle until you (the MCTC) are ready to present the results as your recommendations."*
 - Therefore, TPB would like to move forward with a workshop with the TCC committee to use local knowledge and expertise to draft alternatives that are sensitive to local concerns and issues for use in the model analysis.
 - TCC will also draw from maps scanned from the charrettes.
- Meeting with Secretary Conti
 - Best addressed through his office.
 - Contact information for his Executive Assistant and Director of Scheduling
- Strategic Highway Corridors Vision Plan Revision
 - The resolutions requested the reclassification of US 1 in the SHC Vision Plan.

- Process requires the request be submitted by an MPO, RPO, and/or internal business unit.
- Requests should be sent through the Division 8 Office with assistance from TARPO planner, Matt Day.
- Process is detailed and specific. Requests may fall into one of a specific category.
 - Addition of a new SHC
 - Modification of an existing Corridor
 - Partial or full deletion of an existing Corridor
 - Changes to a proposed facility type
- **Overview of SHC in Moore County**
 - US1 is a key corridor in the overall SHC grid coverage for the state.
 - From the map, taking US 1 out of the SHC grid in Moore County leaves the region without highly mobility connections.
- **US 1 - Corridor 34**
 - Connectivity
 - Interstate Connectivity
 - Interstate Reliever
 - Highway Systems
 - Other
 - Background/Description of Corridor
 - Evacuation Route
- **NC 24/27- Corridor 25**
 - Connectivity
 - Interstate Connectivity
 - Interstate Reliever
 - Highway Systems
 - Other
 - Background/Description of Corridor
 - Does not necessarily meet all requirements to be a SHC
- **MCTC Discussion on How to Move Forward**
 - January 6th MCTC-TCC workshop.
 - When will information be relayed to the MCTC committee and how.
 - How many meetings would MCTC like to have and how often.
- Do we need any sub-committees.

MCTC Discussion:

Jimmy Melton encouraged everyone on the committee to forget about the past.

Frances: TCC meeting planned for January 6, 2012 would like to be able to work with the planners to create the grab bag using the information from the charrettes as well as their local knowledge. Idea is to create the “grab bag” of solutions and then eliminate alternatives based on process.

Nancy Fiorillo: Complimented the Strings and Ribbons exercise and said that she was able to learn from the process even though she is already a planner. Nancy asked that US 1 be taken off

the table until it has been determined whether or not it can be reclassified. She indicated that she will not approve of any plan that recommends changes to US 1 because she knows that's what the citizens in her area want.

Robbie Farrell: Spoke about 136-44.1 and that according to this policy that it doesn't matter what the local interest is if the improvement has to be done so, why is NCDOT even here if they don't care.

Frances Bisby: NCDOT has to balance the statewide needs with the local priorities. This is the opportunity to work with us on those decisions. We still have to adhere to current policies and accommodate future traffic.

Jimmy Melton: We need to find alternatives and follow policies set before us. US 1 is not the only issue in the county and we need to focus on the entire county.

Frances Bisby: We need to continue looking at alternatives while reclassification process goes forward. We can continue the process. If the reclassification is approved, then we can adjust as we move forward.

Chris Smithson: Felt like that had been given two different pieces of information. We were told that if we don't do anything then NCDOT will come up with something for US 1. But, we have also been told that if don't want anything then we shouldn't put a recommendation.

Frances Bisby: In terms of the CTP, if we don't reach consensus; then, there is no CTP. Then there may be a loss in available funding for transportation projects. Public welfare and safety is always a concern when development continues to be permitted. Once safety becomes an issue, NCDOT has to respond. If transportation improvements are necessary due to safety and there is no plan in place; then, the mitigating solutions may not be the context sensitive solution of a locally preferred plan.

Ray MacKay: Is the solution presented to us by MAB at the September 28th meeting out the window?

Frances Bisby: No, but it will have to go through project development to study the different alternatives. The MAB scenario will be taken into consideration.

Chris Smithson: There was a vote taken at the Southern Pines meeting that determined that they did would not agree to upgrade US 1 to freeway status.

Frances Bisby: (Read the document that was signed by the municipalities aloud to the committee and public.)

Robbie Farrell: Restated that policy that NCDOT will do what they want without consideration for what locals want.

Frances Bisby: No, there just has to be a balance between statewide needs and local priorities.

George Erickson: I was disappointed about the consensus that was agreed upon regarding US 1 by the municipalities. US 1 is not the only issue in the county. I understand the concern about horse country because there is a 750 home equestrian development in Foxfire. There was a proposal for NC 24/27 to go straight through Foxfire and, although it would have devastated the village, it was understood that something had to be done.

Jimmy Melton: We have an opportunity to voice our opinion. As long as we are able to develop an alternative; NCDOT will not be able to do just what they want.

Fred Walden: Is project based on traffic counts?

Frances Bisby: Origin and Destination study is used for the model to show traffic patterns. Traffic volumes and projections are a part of the travel demand analysis.

Fred Walden: Reclassification may not be the answer?

Frances Bisby: Not based on the SHC criteria shown in the presentation earlier. You may have a chance to get US 1 reclassified based on the 2040 planning procedures, but based on current policy, US 1 fits every category listed under the SHC criteria. I think it will be an uphill battle getting US 1 reclassified because of what it is.

Fred Walden: Are you going to be working with the planners?

Frances Bisby: Yes, I will be working with the planners during the workshop. We are still waiting for Jumetta's results to come back to present to the committee.

Jimmy Melton: Planning will be better once we have the resolutions from the charrettes because then NCDOT will know how the community feels.

O'Linda Gillis: Are there resolutions signed by Carthage and Cameron like there was for the US 1 corridor? Is it too late for them to create one?

Frances Bisby: No, it is not too late. They can provide that at any time.

Don Campbell: We need to go ahead and put lines on a map so we have somewhere to start.

Jimmy Melton: Lines on a map are premature right now.

Frances Bisby: Clarified that Don meant to have something similar to a workshop to put ideas on a map like what the TCC meeting will be used to do.

Don Campbell: We can work better by looking at a map rather than sitting around and just talking about what we want. Cameron already knows where they would like the line to be drawn.

Jimmy Melton: We are not all at that point.

Frances: Based on resolutions, NCDOT needs to know exactly where the horse county boundaries are located. If this is going to be a local priority, then we will need to have it shown on the map and know what we need to try to avoid.

Public Comments

Mike Smith: We need to be looking at the needs of the county. An origin and destination study done previously showed that only 13percent of the traffic is actually through traffic. The origin and destination study that will be done in 2012 will be done during a time that NC 211 is under construction, so counts done will not be accurate because people will be avoiding that area.

Earl Ingram: The needs of the county need to be met, but not disturb the quality of life. He sat at 6 different tables during the charrettes and the resolution was the same as what the US 1 municipalities signed. The committee should make sure that they take the public into consideration when determining alternatives.

Jonathan Poverud: The county is focusing on economic development, but does not have a transportation plan to support it. We need the transportation plan to bring jobs to the area.

Steven Later: The laws and policies presented early are very vague and can be interpreted however it is convenient. The objection is not that US 1 should be a Strategic Highway Corridor just that it doesn't need to be upgraded to freeway status. The legislature did not vote on the Strategic Highway Corridor plan. It seems that the county's resolution is very clear.

No further comments, meeting was adjourned by Mr. Melton.